

REMARKS

Drawing Objection

Figure 1 is objected to since it should be labeled as "Prior Art". Figure 1 has been amended to provide the label of "Prior Art". Entry of this new Figure 1 is respectfully requested.

35 USC §101 Rejections

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner asserts that the claims need to be directed towards a "computer-implemented" method. Taking the Examiners comments into consideration claims 1-4 have been amended to recite a "computer-implemented" method. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

35 USC §112 Rejections

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner asserts that claims 4 and 8 appear to be literal English translations having grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claims 4 and 8 discuss occupancy data which is illustrated in Figure 7 and discussed on page,

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached hereto are Replacement Drawings wherein Figure 1 is designated by the legend
“PRIOR ART”, as requested.

lines 18-23 of the specification. Taking the Examiner's comments into consideration claims 4 and 8 have been amended. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita (U.S. 6,330,574), in view of Dean et al. (U.S. 2002/0152244).

The present invention is according to claims 1 and 5 is a system and method for code processing of document data. Processing begins by encoding a document data written in an extensible text format description language of to code data using a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format. The translation table defines link information of other translation tables. Also, the translation table defines a code length and a code assigned to items of the link information, an element name, an element value of the element name, an attribute name designated in the element name, an attribute value of the attribute name. Further, the translation table defines a code length and a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name.

Murashita describes compression and decompression of tags in a markup document. A tag code table is created based upon a tag extracted by a tag extracting unit. The Examiner asserts that the tag code table is equivalent to the translation table of the present invention. The Examiner admits that tag code table of Murashita is not written in a description language of an extensible text

format.

Dean et al. describes using lookup tables encoded as XML files. These lookup tables store translations of element names and help strings as well as labels. The Examiner admits that Dean et al. does not teach defining a code assigned to items of link information. Therefore, Dean et al. does not teach the “translation table defining link information of other translation tables, defining a code length and a code assigned to items of said link information, an element name, an element value of said element name, an attribute name designated in said element name, an attribute value of said attribute name, and defining a code length and a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name”. However, the Examiner asserts that these elements are “commonly known”.

The Examiner’s grounds of rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, the Examiner’s assertion that the elements of claims 1 and 5 are “commonly known” is respectfully traversed. This assertion that the elements are “commonly known” is the same as taking official notice that they are “well known” in the art. As indicated in MPEP §2144.03 the applicant has the right to request that the Examiner produce a document teaching the claimed elements which are well known. The applicant requests that such a document be supplied by the Examiner.

Further, **Murashita**, in view of **Dean**, teaches a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format for the purpose of further expanding the definition of the DTD.

In particular, **Murashita** must decode the received code data to a document data in a receiver (decompressing apparatus). Then, a logical structure of elements in the document data is analyzed

and processed by a parser.

On the other hand, the present invention can perform a document processing directly from the received code data in a receiver. Because the translation table in the present invention defines additionally the code for element (and attribute) value. Thus, a parser is not necessary for the present invention.

The DTD generally defines the element (and the attribute) name and the parentage structure, but does not define the element (and attribute) value and the data type. **Murashita** in view of **Dean** does not encode these values in a sender. Therefore, **Murashita** must translate the received code data to a document data in a receiver, and therefore must parse the translated document data. Thus, a parser is necessary for **Murashita**.

Xlink can define link information of any other translation table. However, the document processing can not be performed directly without decoding the received code data to a document data.

According to the present invention, it is effective that a processing load is small for the receiver that has only a low performance, for example, a portable telephone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 5 patentably distinguish over the prior art relied upon by reciting, as exemplified by claim 1,

“A computer implemented method executable by a computer and embedded in a computer readable medium for code processing of document data comprising the steps of: encoding a document data written in a description language of an extensible text format to a code data, based on a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format; and processing said code data as said document data based on said translation table, said translation table defining link

information of other translation tables, defining a code length and a code assigned to items of said link information, an element name, an element value of said element name, an attribute name designated in said element name, an attribute value of said attribute name, and defining a code length and a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name.” (Emphasis Added)

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita (U.S. 6,330,574), in view of Dean et al. (U.S. 2002/0152244) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-8, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 011736
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attachment: Replacement Sheet for FIG. 1

H:\HOME\GSTEVEN\S\01\011736\Amendment